

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated March 2, 2011, and the Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief dated March 9, 2011.

Claims 19, 22, 26, 27, 30, 34, and 36-42 have been amended and Claim 35 has been cancelled. The application now includes Claims 19-34 and 36-42 with Claims 19, 27 and 36 being the only independent claims. Favorable reconsideration, in view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, is respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner has objected to Claim 38 for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 2-3 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 19-42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 3-4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 19-42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On page 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 26, 34 and 42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 5-6 of the Official Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 19-34 and 36-41 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, set forth therein. It is believed that the above amendments to these claims overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Accordingly, it is believed that independent Claims 19, 27 and 36, along with their associated dependent claims, namely Claims 20-26 for Claim 19, Claims 28-34 for Claim 27, and Claims 37-42 for Claim 36, are in condition for allowance.

On pages 4-5 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 35 and 42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ono (U.S. Patent No. 7,523,635). [Note: the Examiner cited "Coleman (2003/0080606)" in the rejection heading but it is clear that he meant to cite the Ono patent since his detailed

reasons for rejection used the disclosure from the Ono patent and not Coleman]. As discussed above, Claim 35 has been cancelled and Claim 42, which now depends from independent Claim 36, is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 36.

In view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner does not believe that the above remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please contact Applicants' attorney by telephone at (419) 255-5900 to discuss this application prior to the issuance of a further action in this case by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas V. Pavelko/
Douglas V. Pavelko
Reg. No. 36,888

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900